UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/813,326 03/30/2004		Per Gisle Djupesland	44508-058	5109
21890 PROSKAUER	7590 05/03/201 ROSE LLP	EXAMINER		
One Internation	1 1000	MENDOZA, MICHAEL G		
Boston, MA 02	110		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			3734	
			NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			05/03/2010	ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

mahmed@proskauer.com NYPatentAdmin@proskauer.com

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)		
10/813,326	DJUPESLAND, PER GISLE		
Examiner	Art Unit		

	MICHAEL G. MENDOZA	3/34	
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence add	ress
THE REPLY FILED <u>22 March 2010</u> FAILS TO PLACE THIS AP	PLICATION IN CONDITION FOR A	ALLOWANCE.	
1. The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on application, applicant must timely file one of the following rapplication in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appe for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 C periods:	eplies: (1) an amendment, affidavit al (with appeal fee) in compliance	, or other evidence, w with 37 CFR 41.31; or	hich places the (3) a Request
a) The period for reply expiresmonths from the mailing	date of the final rejection.		
b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Acono event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire to	ter than SIX MONTHS from the mailing	date of the final rejection	n.
Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (I MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f		FIRST REPLY WAS FI	LED WITHIN TWO
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date of have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extruder 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). NOTICE OF APPEAL	ension and the corresponding amount of hortened statutory period for reply origin	of the fee. The appropria nally set in the final Offic	ate extension fee e action; or (2) as
2. The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in compl	iance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be f	iled within two months	s of the date of
filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exter Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed wi AMENDMENTS			e appeal. Since a
	out prior to the date of filing a brief,	will <u>not</u> be entered be	cause
(a) They raise new issues that would require further cor			
(b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below	•		
(c) They are not deemed to place the application in bett	er form for appeal by materially rec	lucing or simplifying t	ne issues for
appeal; and/or (d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a c	orresponding number of finally reje	ected claims	
NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).	erresponding names or imany reje	otou olamio.	
4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.12	1. See attached Notice of Non-Cor	mpliant Amendment (I	PTOL-324).
5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s):			,
6. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be alle	·	imely filed amendmer	nt canceling the
non-allowable claim(s).	_		_
7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) [how the new or amended claims would be rejected is prov The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:		be entered and an e	xplanation of
Claim(s) allowed: <u>9</u> .			
Claim(s) objected to: <u>7,12 and 13</u> .			
Claim(s) rejected: <u>5-8,11,14-18 and 40-76</u> . Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:			
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE			
 The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and 			
was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).			
 The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to of showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary 	vercome <u>all</u> rejections under appea	l and/or appellant fail:	s to provide a
10. The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation			
REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER			
11. The request for reconsideration has been considered but	does NOT place the application in	condition for allowan	ce because:
12. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s).		
13. Other: See Continuation Sheet.			
/TODD E. MANAHAN/			
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 3734			

Continuation of 13. Other:

The applicant argues the correctness of the finality of the office action. The appliant has had the opportunity to argue the rejections in response to the rejections in the office action of 10/20/2009. Merely arguing the Finality of a rejection, does not excuse applicant of filing a complete response to all outstanding objections, rejections and other requiremetrs set forth int eh outstanding office action. Since the applicant has been given the opportunity to argue the rejections and the rejections have already been applied twice, the status of the finality of the office action 1/22/2010 stands.

The applicant argues that Seidel does not seal one of the nostrils and does not teach closing the oropharyngeal velum. The examiner disagrees. A seal is formed when end D is inserted into the nostril. Because end D is inserted into the nostril the end with hinder/prevent escape of gas through the one nostril. As to the limitation of closing the oropharyngeal velum, Seidel teaches exhaling through the mouth to deliver a substance through end D. It would be inherent that the velum be closed since the velum is closed by exhalation through the mouth.

As to claims 11 ad 67-74 rejected by Seidel, the applicant argues that the act of plug a nostril not receiving treatment when using a nasal treatment requiring only one nostril does not read on the limitation of providing a flow resistance to gas flow exiting the other nostril. The examiner disagrees. The act of close one nostril causes resistance to gas flow out of the nostril. As defined in Merriam-Webster Online Dictionary, resistance is an actor or instance of resisting. Closing one nostril resists the gas flow out of the nostril and therefore reads on the limitation. Because one nostril is closed and on nostril is receiving a flow of gas, and positive pressure would be created in the nasal airway.

As to claims 11, 40-42, 47, 52, 55, 67-72, 75, and 76 rejected by Harding, the applicant argues that the act of plug a nostril not receiving treatment when using a nasal treatment requiring only one nostril does not read on the limitation of providing a flow resistance to gas flow exiting the other nostril. The examiner disagrees. The act of close one nostril causes resistance to gas flow out of the nostril. As defined in Merriam-Webster Online Dictionary, resistance is an actor or instance of resisting. Closing one nostril resists the gas flow out of the nostril and therefore reads on the limitation. Because one nostril is closed and on nostril is receiving a flow of gas, and positive pressure would be created in the nasal airway.

As to claims 11, 14-17, 40-47, 52-55, 58, 61-63, 75, and 76 rejected by Keldman et al. in view of Chantrel, the applicant argues that the act of plug a nostril not receiving treatment when using a nasal treatment requiring only one nostril does not read on the limitation of providing a flow resistance to gas flow exiting the other nostril. The examiner disagrees. The act of close one nostril causes resistance to gas flow out of the nostril. As defined in Merriam-Webster Online Dictionary, resistance is an actor or instance of resisting. Closing one nostril resists the gas flow out of the nostril and therefore reads on the limitation. Because one nostril is closed and on nostril is receiving a flow of gas, and positive pressure would be created in the nasal airway. The applicant also argues that the combination of Keldman et al. with Chantrel would have required a fundament change in the operation of the base device. The examiner disagrees. The use of the seal of Chantrel only requires the insertion of the seal into the open end of nasal piece 12. The insertion of the seal in no way changes the operation of the base device. The device will still be inserted into a nostril, and the user would still use exhalation to provide flow..